

REMARKS

The Examiner has restricted the claims into what has been characterized as the following groups:

Group I: claims 1-12 and 25-29, drawn to a method for fabricating a brazeable diamond product;


Group II: claims 13-24, drawn to a brazeable diamond product.

The Examiner asserts that the inventions of Groups I and II are related as process of making and product made and specifically asserts that the product can be made by a materially different process, such as CVD. However, if Groups I and I are related as asserted by the Examiner, there is no undue burden on the Examiner to search claims 1-12 and 25-29 along with claims 13-24 in one application. *See* MPEP § 803 (stating that “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.”) (emphasis added).

In order to be fully responsive, Applicant elects the invention of Group I, claims 1-12 and 25-29, with traverse and respectfully submits that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn. Applicant has also added newly presented claims 30 and 31 to more clearly define the invention. Support for these claims appears in the specification at pages 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and the abstract. No new matter has been added.

Applicants enclose a check in the amount of \$36.00. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,



Kristin D. Mallatt
Reg. No. 46,895

OF COUNSEL:

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Suite 2800
1100 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia, 30309-4530
404.815.6147